

February 20, 1976

SENATOR STULL: Senator Keyes, that wasn't my decision. When the Stockgrowers and the Brand Committee got together and this was discussed at a meeting they had in Scottsbluff last fall is when they made their determination the method that they would go about to raise this money and it was their decision that it be put on the recording fees because those haven't been raised for years and years and the fees have increased. I would move the bill be advanced.

PRESIDENT: Senator Stoney.

SENATOR STONEY: Mr. President, a question of Senator Stull, please. Was he closing? Senator Stull, I just wondered, is there any appropriation from the state for this Commission at all or are they all self sustaining?

SENATOR STULL: Senator Stoney, as long as this group of people has operated, there was only one year that there was any state funds went into their operation and that was two or three years ago when Senator Carpenter put an amendment on an appropriation bill to give them \$50,000. It is a self supporting fee organization of the cattle, the ranchers.

SENATOR STONEY: They are not provided any office space at the expense of the state?

SENATOR STULL: They are provided some room over here, yes.

SENATOR STONEY: Okay, but the allocation is strictly generated through their Commission and the cattle?

SENATOR STULL: Yes.

SENATOR STONEY: Thank you.

PRESIDENT: Senator Schmit.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, I am amazed that the bill should require this much time. The bill provides, principally, for those individuals who pay the fees for registration, that they pay a \$15 fee instead of a \$5 fee. The bill is requested by the Stockgrowers. They recognize the necessity for having increased revenue because of inflation that has increased the cost of their operation of their office. They requested it. We are not forcing it upon them. The Committee is just attempting to help them along with Senator Stull's bill to try to get the revenue they need to operate their office. Secondly, there are many brands, desirable brands, that are being held today by individuals who simply want to keep them for purposes of sentimentality, I suppose, so they can have their brand hanging on the wall. That brand should be returned to use if it is not an active brand, or, at least, if it is kept by an individual as a matter of pride in ownership, then the individual certainly has no objection to an increase in the fee. I think that many of us in eastern Nebraska who use brands use them as a matter of identification, and frankly, Senator Keyes, I am sure Senator Stull answered you, but you do not need